



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/006,948	12/03/2001	Robert J. Dugan	POU920010169US1	2758
7590	12/18/2007	Floyd A. Gonzalez IBM Corporation 2455 South Road, P386 Poughkeepsie, NY 12601	EXAMINER MATTIS, JASON E	
			ART UNIT 2616	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/18/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/006,948	DUGAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jason E. Mattis	2616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 October 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All
 - b) Some *
 - c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the Request for Continued Examination filed 10/3/07. Claims 1-20 are currently pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14, and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ratcliff et al. (U.S. Pat. 5740438) in view Shah (U.S. Pat. 6889380 B1) and Lioy (U.S. Pat. 6775553).

With respect to claims 1, 6, 11, and 16, Ratcliff et al. discloses a method, process, and computer program product stored on a computer readable medium for assigning addresses to a channel adapter in a data processing system including a server, multiple partitions, a fabric, and a channel adapter communicating between the partitions and the fabric (**See the abstract, column 4 lines 31-65, and Figure 3 of Ratcliff et al. for reference to a method, process, and program stored as software on a computer readable medium for an address assigning method in a system, as**

shown in Figure 3, including processing system 11, which is a server, multiple partitions 13, 15, 17, 19, 20, and 21, a host to network interface 67, which is a fabric, and a channel connection 29, which is a connection from a port of a channel adapter of the processing system 11 to the host to network interface 67).

Ratcliff et al. also discloses assigning a unique address identification to each partition for each request, storing the address identifications in a table in the fabric, and returning the assigned address identification with multiple addresses being assigned to the same channel adapter, such that when a message is sent from the fabric to a partition via the channel adapter, the sender of the message sees multiple channel adapters corresponding to the multiple partitions (**See column 5 line 53 to column 6 line 35 and Figures 4-5 of Ratcliff et al. for reference to the host to network interface 67 assigning unique addresses to each partition, storing the addresses in a network to host connection table, and returning the assigned addresses for each request with multiple addresses being assigned to each adapter, for example, partitions 2, 3, and 4 each being assigned a unique logical address through the same port 1, meaning that when a message is sent from the fabric to a partition via the network interface 67, the sender of the message sees multiple network interfaces corresponding to the addresses of the multiple partitions**). Although Ratcliff et al. discloses assigning multiple unique addresses to a single channel adapter with each address corresponding to a separate partition, Ratcliff et al. does not specifically disclose a method by which the addresses are assigned to the channel adapter, for example the addresses being assigned by the fabric.

With respect to claims 1, 6, 11, and 16, Shah, in the field of communications, discloses a fabric assigning multiple unique addresses to a single channel adapter (**See column 7 lines 1-43, column 8 line 63 to column 9 line 15, and Figure 6 of Shah for reference to a single channel adapter, i.e. channel adapter 638, being assigned by a subnet manager that is part of a fabric multiple addresses corresponding to multiple attachment points of the channel adapter 638, with the addresses assigned to the channel adapter 638 being stored in forwarding tables of the fabric**). A fabric assigning multiple unique addresses to a single channel adapter has the advantage of allowing address allocation to devices of a fabric to be controlled by a single entity of the fabric, such that address conflicts can more easily be avoided.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, when presented with the work of Shah, to combine a fabric assigning multiple unique addresses to a single channel adapter, as suggested by Shah, with the system and method of Ratcliff et al. , with the motivation being to allow address allocation to devices of a fabric to be controlled by a single entity of the fabric, such that address conflicts can more easily be avoided.

With respect to claims 1, 6, 11, and 16, although the combination of Ratcliff et al. and Shah discloses a fabric assigning multiple unique addresses to a single channel adapter with the addresses corresponding to multiple partitions, the combination of Ratcliff et al. and Shah does not specifically disclose assigning the addresses in response to multiple requests for addresses to be assigned.

With respect to claims 1, 6, 11, and 16, Lioy, in the field of communications, discloses sending requests for address identifications to be assigned, assigning unique addresses in response to each request, and returning the assigned addresses for each request (**See column 3 line 66 to column 4 line 11 of Lioy for reference to at initialization, requesting an IP address in a Configure-Request message and assigning a unique IP address in response to each request where the assigned IP address is returned in a Configure-Ack message**). Sending requests for address identifications to be assigned, assigning unique addresses in response to each request, and returning the assigned addresses for each request has the advantage of allowing unique IP addresses to be assigned on an as needed basis as they are requested, such that components that do not currently need and IP address do not waste IP address resources that could be used by other components.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, when presented with the work of Lioy, to combine sending requests for address identifications to be assigned, assigning unique addresses in response to each request, and returning the assigned addresses for each request, as suggested by Lioy, with the system and method of Ratcliff et al. and Shah , with the motivation being to allow unique IP addresses to be assigned on an as needed basis as they are requested, such that components that do not currently need and IP address do not waste IP address resources that could be used by other components.

With respect to claims 2, 7, 12, and 17, Ratcliff et al. discloses establishing the table in the fabric responsive to the first request (**See column 5 lines 53-60 of Ratcliff**

et al. for reference to establishing entries in the network to host connection table responsive to an initialization sequence).

With respect to claims 3, 8, 13, and 18, Ratcliff et al. discloses that the table is stored in a name server in the fabric (**See column 4 line 66 to column 5 line 18, column 5 lines 53-60, and Figure 4 of Ratcliff et al.** for reference to the table being stored in a memory 83, that acts as a name server in the HNI 67).

With respect to claims 4, 9, 14, and 19, the combination of Ratcliff et al. and Shah does not disclose sending a proposed address in a request and confirming that the proposed address is assigned.

With respect to claims 4, 9, 14, and 19, Lioy, in the field of communications, discloses sending a proposed address in a request and confirming that the proposed address is assigned (**See column 3 line 66 to column 4 line 11 of Lioy for reference to generating and sending a Configure-Request message, which is an address request message including an IP address, and for reference to sending a Configuration-Ack message, which is a message confirming that the address is assigned**). Sending a proposed address in a request and confirming that the proposed address is assigned has the advantage of allowing the device that will be using an address to determine its own address based on the device's needs.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, when presented with the work of Lioy, to combine sending a proposed address in a request and confirming that the proposed address is assigned, as suggested by Lioy, with the system and method of Ratcliff et al. and Shah, with the

motivation being to allow the device that will be using an address to determine its own address based on the device's needs.

4. Claims 5, 10, 15, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ratcliff et al. in view of Shah and Lioy and in further view of Kanemaki et al. (U.S. Pat. 6081845).

With respect to claims 5, 10, 15, and 20, the combination of Ratcliff et al., Shah, and Lioy does not disclose sending an updated address and updating address data stored with the updated address.

With respect to claims 5, 10, 15, and 20, Kanemaki et al., discloses sending an updated address and updating address data stored with the updated address (**See column 13 lines 24-32 of Kanemaki et al. for reference to sending a message to update the address of an address already stored in a table**). Sending an updated address and updating address data stored with the updated address has the advantage of allowing devices to notify an address server of an address change so that an address table of the address server has the most up to date address data.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, when presented with the work of Kanemaki et al., to combine sending an updated address and updating address data stored with the updated address, as suggested by Kanemaki et al., with the system and method of Ratcliff et al., Shah, and Lioy, with the motivation being to allow devices to notify an address server of an

address change so that an address table of the address server has the most up to date address data.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason E. Mattis whose telephone number is (571) 272-3154. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8AM-5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Huy Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3155. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Jason E Mattis
Examiner
Art Unit 2616

jem